

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 15 for under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for lacking antecedent basis and claims 1-10 12-17, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103 for being obvious. Claims 1-10, 12-17, and 28-30 remain in the application

Claim 15 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being obvious based on Sato and Chen. Sato describes a beam approach to making scribe lines. Chen teaches using patterned photoresist to open a line to what would otherwise be a blanket etch. The Examiner's view is that it would be obvious to combine them. Applicants respectfully disagree. Sato's approach needs no patterned mask because the beam that provides the etching is controlled so as to only etch in the areas where needed. Chen's approach requires a mask because without it the whole wafer would be etched. Applicants have not been able to find any basis in either Sato or Chen that would provide a basis for the Examiner's necessary conclusion that there is an incentive to combine them. Accordingly applicants submit that the rejection of claim 1 and the rejection of all other claims based on this combination, which include claims 2-10, 12-14, and 16-17, are improper.

The Examiner viewed claim 28 obvious in view of Sato in combination with Smart. Smart teaches multiple sources combined to provide an optimum shaped pulse. These different laser sources of Smart are not provided consecutively and thus do not meet the requirement in claim 28 of "a first radiation beam of a first power followed by a second radiation of a second power different from the first power ..." The Examiner in particular pointed to FIG. 1C of Smart, which shows pulses of different powers, but this figure is a depiction that there is available a choice of pulses, not that pulses of different powers are to be applied consecutively. Accordingly, applicants submit that this combination does not render applicants invention obvious and that this also true for dependent claims 29 and 30.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited. Please contact the below-signed if there are any issues regarding this communication or otherwise concerning the current application.


Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescall Semiconductor, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By:

  
James L. Clingan, Jr.  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 30,163  
Telephone: (512) 996-6839  
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854  
Email: Jim.Clingan@Freescall.com